

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 10/735,406 | 12/12/2003 | Robert Indech | 23050-RA | 2092 | |
| 30184 | 7590 04/13/2006 | | EXAMINER | | |
| MYERS & KAPLAN, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, L.L.C. 1899 POWERS FERRY ROAD | | | GREENE, DANIEL LAWSON | | |
| SUITE 310 | KS FERRI KUAD | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| ATLANTA, | GA 30339 | | 3663 | | |
| | | | | DATE MAILED: 04/13/2006 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|----------------------|----------------|--|--|
| 10/735,406 | INDECH, ROBERT | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| Daniel L. Greene Jr. | 3663 | | |

| | Daniei L. Greene Jr. | 3003 | | | | |
|--|---|--|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the d | correspondence add | ress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>04 April 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: | | | | | | |
| a) | isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th | | er is later. In no | | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) | ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE F | | OWT NIHTIW C | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | | | | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in composition of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS | xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e) |), to avoid dismissal o | of the appeal. | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); | | | | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | corresponding number of finally re | ejected claims. | | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | | ompliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | |
| 7. To purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10,13,14,89 and 91-95</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>11,12,15-88 and</u> | ' <u>90</u> . | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apper ry and was not earlier presented. | eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41 33(d) | ils to provide a (1). | | | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | on of the status of the claims after | entry is below or attac | ched. | | | |
| 11. \(\sum \) The request for reconsideration has been considered by of the same reasons set forth in section 3 above. | , | .• | ance because: | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. Other: | (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper | No(s): | | | | |
| | | Kirth | | | | |
| | SUPERVISORY PA | ENT EXAMINER | | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicants response does not specifically address each and every issue presented by the examiner in the 10/7/2005 Final Rejection which in tern refers back to the 7/19/2005 Office Action and at best requires further consideration that goes beyond a cursory review extended after final amendments. Whether applicant has denounced cold fusion or not, the fact remains that the Examiner has shown how and in what manner the invention is actually related to and considered to be such. Additionally the examiner has cited multiple documents as evidence that the Examiners contentions are in agreement with the scientific community. Further, regarding applicants assertion that the attached articles and documents clearly and undisputedly show the term "atomically sharp" is well-understood and accepted within the art, it is noted that applicant has failed to disclosed specifically and exactly where such proof can be found and upon cursory review it is not seen wherein such is so nor wherein the definition, metes and bounds of the term "atomically sharp" are set forth.